arXiv:1410.8346v2 [quant-ph] 23 May 2016

COALESCENT PHOTONS IN BLACKBODY RADIATION

Aleksey Ilyin*
Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology
(Dated: May 24, 2016)

Within the Bose-Einstein statistics it is shown that the blackbody radiation contains coalescent photons along with single photons. Coalescent photons were first observed in the famous Hong-Ou-Mandel experiment of 1987. For the sake of convenience, N coalescent photons are referred to as the N-photon cluster. In this work, statistics of photon clusters and probability that a photon cluster contains N photons are found versus radiation frequency and temperature. Spectra of photon-cluster radiation are calculated as functions of blackbody temperature for different cluster ranks. Derivation of the Planck's radiation law is discussed in view of the existence of photon clusters in blackbody radiation.

PACS numbers: 14.70.Bh; 42.50.-p; 44.40.+a
Keywords: Bose-Einstein statistics, thermal radiation, Planck's formula, coalescent photons

I. INTRODUCTION

In this work we consider yet unknown properties of blackbody radiation, which are derived here from the Bose-Einstein (BE) statistics. It is proven that a part of blackbody radiation energy is carried by coalescent photons.

Coalescent photons were first discovered by Hong, Ou and Mandel in their seminal experiment [1]. Since then, physics of coalescent photons has attracted growing attention fostered by the possibility of using coalescent photons in quantum information science and in the tests of fundamental concepts of quantum physics [2–4].

The properties of coalescent photons are usually analyzed theoretically on the basis of wave functions [5–7]. A new approach to this problem proposed in this work is based on quantum statistics and provides new information on the physics of coalescent photons in blackbody radiation.

In this paper, K coalescent photons are referred to as a K-photon cluster or a photon cluster of rank K. Such terminology is justified because two coalescent photons were found to interact with a beamsplitter as if they were a single quantum object [8]. In other words, this single quantum object, or a two-photon cluster, is either transmitted through the beam splitter, or reflected from it as a whole.

It is shown in Sections II-V that the BE statistics predicts the existence of photon clusters in thermal radiation and determines both the cluster statistics and radiation spectra for clusters of various ranks in a blackbody cavity.

The existence of photon clusters in thermal radiation is a formal consequence of the fact that the BE statistics is a negative binomial distribution (NBD), which is known to be a special case of *Compound Poisson Distribution* [9]. That means that the BE statistics describes random events of two different types: elementary events and compound events, each compound event consisting of random number of elementary events. An example of random process described by a Compound Poisson Distribution is shown in Fig. 1.

In the case of photon statistics, an elementary event may only be the registration of one photon by an ideal detector. Then a compound event will be a simultaneous registration of several photons, i. e. a photon cluster.



Figure 1. An example of discrete random process described by the *Compound Poisson Distribution*. Discrete events occur at random moments of time t_1, t_2, ... t_n, ... Some events shown in the figure, like those of t_1, t_3 and t_4, are elementary (or single) events, while there are also compound events, like the double-event at t_2, or triple-event at t_5 that consists of three elementary events occurring at the same time.

Basic ideas required to understand further results are introduced in Section II, which explains why the BE statistics predicts the existence of photon clusters.

In Section III and Appendix 1, a formal proof is given that photon clusters are inherent to the BE statistics. Section IV shows that the BE statistics is the result of superposition of two random processes, first, a random number of photon clusters entering a given phase-space volume; second, a random number of photons contained in each cluster. Such superposition of two random processes is known as a superposition of distributions.

Radiation spectra of photon clusters of various ranks in the blackbody cavity are found in Section V. It is shown that the sum of cluster radiation spectra taken over all cluster ranks (from unity to infinity) yields the Planck's radiation law for blackbody radiation spectrum as a function of frequency (ν-spectrum). Thus, it is shown that clusterization of photons does not affect the ν-spectrum of blackbody radiation.

In contrast to the ν-spectrum, the λ-spectrum of blackbody radiation is found to be sensitive to the process of photon clusterization, which shall inevitably result in some modification of the Planck's radiation law for the λ-spectrum of blackbody radiation. However, the actual degree of clusterization, as shown in Section VI, leads to

* a.v.ilyin@mail.mipt.ru

a minor modification of the Planck's radiation law not exceeding 7.5% in its maximum for reasonable temperatures of blackbody radiation.

Main results of this work are discussed in Conclusions (Section VII).

II. BASIC IDEAS

In this Section we consider classical and quantum probabilities $p_n(\tau)$ that n particles are in some volume τ. All phase-space volumes are assumed to be measured in the units of $\hbar^3$ while three-dimensional volumes are measured in coherence volumes. Therefore, all volumes in this article are dimensionless.

A. Simplified classical approach

In the classical case, the probability that n noninteracting particles are in volume τ is determined by the Poisson statistics:

$$p_n(\tau) = \frac{(w\tau)^n}{n\,!}\, e^{-w\tau}, \tag{1}$$

where ω - is the average number of particles per unit volume. According to (1), the probability that no particles are in volume τ is

$$p_0(\tau) = e^{-\omega\tau}, \tag{2}$$

therefore, (1) can be written as

$$p_n(\tau) = \frac{(w\tau)^n}{n\,!}\, p_0(\tau). \tag{3}$$

In some theoretical considerations it is convenient to deal with relative probabilities defined as

$$q_n(\tau) = \frac{p_n(\tau)}{p_0(\tau)}, \tag{4}$$

which for Poisson statistics (3) yields

$$q_n(\tau) = \frac{(w\tau)^n}{n\,!}. \tag{5}$$

In this case $q_n(\tau)$ will be proportional to τ^n for any volume τ. For example, relative probability that one particle is in an arbitrary volume τ

$$q_1(\tau) \sim \tau, \tag{6}$$

while the probability that two particles are in the same volume

$$q_2(\tau) \sim \tau^2, \tag{7}$$

which is natural because classical particles enter the volume independently of each other.

Now let us consider a gas of classical particles that may stick together with some nonzero probability. In this case, two particles stuck together will form a new object that may be termed a two-particle "molecule" or a two-particle "cluster". Such molecules, like separate particles, will enter the selected volume independently of each other. Therefore, the probability that n molecules are in volume τ must obey Poisson statistics (1) but with a different value of molecule density w.

Consequently, relative probability that one molecule is in volume τ should be proportional to τ by analogy with (6). For this reason, if two *coalescent* particles are in the selected volume then relative probability of such event is proportional to τ, while the same probability will be proportional to τ^2 if the two particles are separate. Therefore, relative probability $q_2(\tau)$ that two particles are in volume τ in the general case should be

$$q_2(\tau) \sim k_1\tau + k_2\tau^2, \tag{8}$$

where the first term describes the probability that a two-particle molecule is in volume τ while the second term is responsible for the probability that two separate particles are in the said volume.

If two particles are stuck together then they are not independent. Therefore, formula (8) signifies a departure from the classical Poisson statistics (1), which is applicable to independent particles only. The polynomial character of relative probability (8) as a function of volume indicates that some particles are stuck together and exist in the form of clusters, or molecules, while other particles remain separate.

B. Simplified quantum approach

It is easy to show that quantum statistics yields for relative probability $q_2(\tau)$ a non-classical dependence against volume similar to eq. (8).

Indeed, the BE statistics is usually considered for a single cell of phase space

$$p_n(1) = \frac{w^n}{(1+w)^{n+1}}, \tag{9}$$

where $p_n(1)$ is the probability that n photons are in one coherence volume, w is the average number of photons per coherence volume. Designating quantum and classical probabilities by the same symbol p_n may cause no confusion.

For arbitrary volume τ, the BE statistics has the form:

$$p_n(\tau) = C^n_{\tau+n-1}\frac{w^n}{(1+w)^{n+\tau}}, \tag{10}$$

where

$$C^n_{\tau+n-1} = \frac{(\tau+n-1)\,!}{n\,!\,(\tau-1)\,!} = \frac{\tau(\tau+1)\ldots(\tau+n-1)}{n\,!}. \tag{11}$$

Formula (10) was derived by Leonard Mandel for an integer number of cells [10]. It was later shown in [11] that the Mandel's formula (10) is valid for an arbitrary volume τ including nonintegral number of coherence volumes. It is clear that the last expression in (11) makes sense for any positive volume $\tau > 0$. If $\tau = 1$ then (10) becomes the usual expression (9) for the BE statistics in a single cell.

From (10) we obtain the probability that no particles are in volume τ

$$p_0(\tau) = \frac{1}{(1+w)^\tau}. \tag{12}$$

Here we have taken into account that if $n = 0$ then $C^n_{\tau+n-1} = 1$ for any τ.

Given (10) and (12), relative probability that n quantum particles are in volume τ, by analogy with (4), can be written as

$$q_n(\tau) = \frac{p_n(\tau)}{p_0(\tau)} = \frac{\tau(\tau+1)\dots(\tau+n-1)w^n}{n\,!\,(1+w)^n}. \tag{13}$$

Hence, the relative probability that two particles are in volume τ is

$$q_2(\tau) = \frac{\tau(\tau+1)w^2}{2\,!\,(1+w)^2} \sim c_1\tau + c_2\tau^2, \tag{14}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are some coefficients. Eq. (14) for quantum particles is of the same form as eq. (8). Therefore, the volume dependence of relative probability (14) in the BE statistics suggests that some particles may stick together while other particles remain separate.

The simplified analysis presented above is based on an intuitive understanding that if some particles are stuck together then this fact must influence relative probability (14) as a function of volume. In the following Section, a formal solution to this problem is discussed based on the properties of Compound Poisson Distribution as presented in [9].

III. FORMAL SOLUTION IN QUANTUM STATISTICS

Coalescence of particles in BE statistics is a consequence of the fact that the BE statistics coincides with a negative binomial distribution, which has the form

$$p_n(\tau) = C^n_{\tau+n-1} p^\tau (1-p)^n, \tag{15}$$

where coefficients $C^n_{\tau+n-1}$ are defined in (11), parameters p and τ must satisfy $0 \le p \le 1$ and $\tau > 0$, respectively. If parameter

$$p = \frac{1}{1+w} \tag{16}$$

then (15) coincides with the BE statistics (10).

According to [9], probability distribution (15) is a special case of *Compound Poisson Distribution*, so that (15) describes random composite events (like those shown in Figure 1). It was established in [9] that these composite events obey Poisson statistics

$$g_k(\tau) = \frac{(\eta\tau)^k}{k\,!} e^{-\eta\tau}, \tag{17}$$

where η is the average number of composite events per unit volume

$$\eta = \ln\frac{1}{p}, \tag{18}$$

while probability f_k, that a composite event consists of k elementary events, is given by the logarithmic distribution

$$f_k = \frac{(1-p)^k}{k\eta}. \tag{19}$$

In our notations, due to (16), equations (18)-(19) take the form

$$\eta = \ln(1+w), \tag{20}$$

$$f_k = \frac{w^k}{k(1+w)^k \ln(1+w)}. \tag{21}$$

The above results, that were obtained in [9] from the general theory of Compound Poisson Distribution with respect to (15), are derived in *Appendix 1* from the BE statistics without resorting to Compound Poisson Distribution. Such a new derivation provides an independent confirmation of these results.

In the case of quantum statistics, (20) gives the average number of photon clusters per coherence volume (if no distinction is made between clusters of different ranks), while (21) is the probability that a photon cluster consists of k photons, $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$.

IV. COMPOSITION OF DISTRIBUTIONS

The BE statistics is thus the result of superposition of two random processes, first, a random number of photon clusters entering given phase-space volume, second, a random number of photons contained in each cluster. The first random process is described by the Poisson statistics (17) while the second process is described by the logarithmic distribution (21).

Such a superposition of two random processes is termed a *composition of distributions* and entails certain relation between the generating functions of the respective statistics.

Let us denote by $P(z)$ the generating function of the BE statistics (10). By definition of generating function,

$$P(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_n(\tau) z^n = \frac{1}{(1+w-wz)^\tau}. \tag{22}$$

The generating function $G(z)$ of Poisson statistics (17) is

$$G(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} g_k(\tau) z^k = e^{\eta\tau(z-1)}. \tag{23}$$

For generating function $F(z)$ of logarithmic distribution (21) we obtain:

$$F(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f_k z^k = \frac{1}{\eta} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(bz)^k}{k} = \frac{\ln(1-bz)}{\ln(1-b)}, \tag{24}$$

where a notation is introduced

$$b = \frac{w}{1+w}. \tag{25}$$

The BE statistics is the result of composition of distributions (17) and (21), so the generating functions of the statistics involved should satisfy [9]

$$P(z) = G\left[F(z)\right]. \tag{26}$$

Substituting (22), (23) and (24) in (26) we can verify that the latter equation becomes an identity

$$\frac{1}{(1+w-wz)^{\tau}} \equiv \exp\left[\eta\tau\left(\frac{\ln(1-bz)}{\ln(1-b)} - 1\right)\right]. \tag{27}$$

Indeed, given (25) and (20) the right side of (27) can be presented as

$$\exp\left[-\frac{\eta\tau\ln\left(1+w-wz\right)}{\ln\left(1+w\right)}\right] = \exp\left[\ln\left(1+w-wz\right)^{-\tau}\right],$$

which is identical to the left side of (27).

This result for generating functions is another confirmation of correctness of equations (17), (20) and (21) in the BE statistics.

V. PHOTON CLUSTER RADIATION SPECTRA IN BLACKBODY CAVITY

The result of measuring thermal radiation energy in a narrow frequency range will depend on what is actually measured – the number of photons (i. e. the total radiation energy), or the number of clusters. Total radiation energy can be measured, for example, by a bolometer, while the number of clusters can be measured by a photomultiplier tube since a single cluster should produce a single click in the photomultiplier. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish between the radiation spectrum measured by the bolometer and the spectrum measured by photomultiplier. In this section, we will focus on the energy spectrum of thermal radiation measured by a bolometer that, by assumption, absorbs the total radiation energy within the selected narrow frequency interval.

A. Mode-average number of photons in the same-rank cluster radiation

Thermal radiation in a blackbody cavity is usually presented as a sum of standing waves, or modes. Each radiation mode of certain frequency, polarization and direction of propagation corresponds to a single phase-space cell. The Heisenberg uncertainty principle allows one to associate volume of h^3 with a single cell, or mode, in six-dimensional phase-space. This volume projects on the coherence volume in three dimensional space.

Let us find the mode-average number of photons k_m belonging to the m-th rank clusters. Using the average number of clusters η per mode and probability f_m that an arbitrary cluster consists of m photons, we obtain for the average number of m-th rank clusters in a mode

$$\eta_m = \eta f_m. \tag{28}$$

With (20) and (21) taken into account, eq. (28) yields:

$$\eta_m = \frac{1}{m}\left(\frac{w}{1+w}\right)^m. \tag{29}$$

This expression is always less than unity $\eta_m < 1$ since $m = 1, 2, 3, ...$ Therefore, most often, for any integer $m \geq 1$ there are no m-th rank clusters in a mode and only rarely there is one or several such clusters.

Now for the mode-average number of photons k_m that belong to the m-th rank clusters we obtain

$$k_m = m\eta_m = \left(\frac{w}{1+w}\right)^m, \tag{30}$$

which is also always less than unity. Using the known expression for the degeneracy parameter w in the BE statistics (see derivation of (69) in Appendix 1)

$$w = \frac{1}{\exp(\beta\varepsilon) - 1}, \tag{31}$$

we obtain for (30)

$$k_m = e^{-m\beta\varepsilon}, \tag{32}$$

where ε is the energy of single photon, $\beta = \frac{1}{kT}$, and $m\varepsilon$ is the energy of m-th rank cluster.

Multiplying the mode-average number of photons belonging to the m-th rank clusters (32) by the energy ε of a single photon we obtain

$$\varepsilon_m = \varepsilon k_m = \varepsilon \exp\left(-m\beta\varepsilon\right), \tag{33}$$

which is the mode-average energy carried by m-th rank clusters.

B. Spectra of blackbody cluster radiation

The mode-average energy of m-th rank cluster radiation (33) times mode density yields energy density contained in

m-th rank cluster radiation. Before proceeding with this calculation, we have to realize what is the mode density in case of photon cluster radiation.

We do not discuss here the mechanism of photon clusterization in blackbody radiation. In HOM-type experiments (for example, in [1, 12, 13]), indistinguishable photons stick together when they are scattered into two different modes by a beamsplitter. In the blackbody cavity, indistinguishable photons stick together, most probably, due to multiple scattering on the cavity walls. However, the final result of clusterization process, irrespective of its mechanism, is clearly derived from the BE statistics. With that it is important to note that when photons stick together their energy does not change, and hence their frequency remains unchanged. Therefore, a photon cluster belongs to the same frequency range $\Delta\nu$ that contained photons before sticking. For this reason, when photons stick together, their coherence length $\Delta L = \frac{c}{\Delta\nu}$ also remains unchanged. Hence, a photon cluster coherence volume is the same as that of constituent photons. Likewise, the same is the cluster mode density because it is simply the number of coherence volumes per unit volume.

Therefore, when calculating the mode density of photon cluster radiation, we can use the standard expression for mode density in a cavity

$$\Delta N(\varepsilon) = \frac{8\pi\varepsilon^2}{c^3h^3}\Delta\varepsilon, \tag{34}$$

which refers to the energy interval $\Delta\varepsilon = h\Delta\nu$ with two polarizations taken into account.

Now multiplying (33) by (34) we obtain the energy density attributable to the m-th rank photon cluster radiation at frequency ν:

$$u_m(\nu) = \varepsilon_m\Delta N(\varepsilon) = \frac{8\pi h\nu^3}{c^3}\exp\left(-\frac{mh\nu}{kT}\right). \tag{35}$$

This formula, written for a unit frequency interval $\Delta\nu = 1$, solves the problem of finding emission spectra of photon clusters of various ranks in the blackbody cavity.

Note that a photon cluster may have only two polarizations just like a single photon, which is taken into account in equation (34). This is due to the fact that only indistinguishable photons, which have the same momentum (in magnitude and direction) and the same polarization, may stick together [1, 7]. Therefore, all photons contained in a cluster must have the same polarization.

Summing up the energy density of photon cluster radiation (35) as a geometric series over all possible ranks $m = 1, 2, \ldots$ yields total radiation energy density

$$U(\nu) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} u_m(\nu) = \frac{8\pi h\nu^3}{c^3}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\exp\left(-\frac{mh\nu}{kT}\right) = \frac{8\pi h\nu^3}{c^3}\frac{1}{e^{h\nu/kT}-1}. \tag{36}$$

Equation (36) is the standard Planck's formula for radiation energy density in the blackbody cavity. Hence, considerations presented above actually constitute a new method to derive the Planck's radiation law (36) based on the concept of cluster nature of blackbody radiation. Equation (35) is, therefore, a generalization of the Planck's radiation law for thermal radiation of m-th rank photon clusters.

Spectra (35) for cluster radiation energy and (36) for total radiation energy are shown in Fig. 2.



Figure 2. Thermal radiation spectra (35) of photon clusters: 1-single photons, 2-two-photon clusters, 3-three-photon clusters. The sum of all cluster spectra (black curve) yields the Planck's law for blackbody radiation spectrum (36). The relative position of curves 1-2-3 is temperature-independent.

C. The Wien's displacement law for cluster radiation

Equating to zero the derivative of (35) with respect to frequency we obtain the condition for maximum of cluster radiation energy density, which is attained at the frequency

$$\nu_m = \frac{3k}{mh}T. \tag{37}$$

This equation is the Wien's displacement law prototype for the m-th rank cluster radiation. With the increase of rank m the maximum photon cluster radiation energy shifts to a lower frequency. Therefore, clusters of high ranks are emitted mostly at low frequencies, which is also obvious from Fig. 2.

D. The Stefan-Boltzmann law for cluster radiation

Integrating (35) over frequency, we obtain the total energy density of thermal radiation of m-th rank clusters

$$U_m = \sigma_m T^4, \tag{38}$$

which is the Stefan-Boltzmann law prototype for photon cluster radiation. The constant of proportionality in (38)

depends on the rank m of cluster radiation:

$$\sigma_m = \frac{48\pi k^4}{m^4 c^3 h^3}. \tag{39}$$

Obviously, the total energy in cluster radiation decreases sharply with the increase of the cluster rank. Therefore, blackbody radiation energy is carried mostly by single photons, i. e. clusters of rank $m = 1$. Summing (39) over all ranks m, we obtain the usual Stefan-Boltzmann constant:

$$\sigma = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sigma_m = \frac{8\pi^5 k^4}{15 c^3 h^3} \tag{40}$$

where we took into account the known series sum

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m^4} = \frac{\pi^4}{90}. \tag{41}$$

It follows from (39) that the areas under the curves $m = 1$, 2, 3 in Figure 2 are related as $1 : \frac{1}{16} : \frac{1}{81}$.

E. The clusterization degree in blackbody radiation

Let us find the portion ϕ of total radiation energy that is carried by single photons. Using (39) and (40), we obtain

$$\phi = \frac{\sigma_1}{\sigma} = \frac{90}{\pi^4} \simeq 0.9239, \tag{42}$$

in other words, about 92.4% of the total energy of blackbody radiation is carried by single photons. Two-photon clusters, according to (39), account for 16 times less energy, or about 5.77% of the total energy of thermal radiation.

Let us define the degree of clusterization of blackbody radiation as

$$\Theta = \frac{\sigma - \sigma_1}{\sigma} = 1 - \frac{90}{\pi^4} \simeq 0.0761, \tag{43}$$

which means that all multiphoton clusters (starting with two-photon clusters) transfer about 7.6% of thermal radiation energy.

The clusterization degree (43) of thermal radiation is a universal constant that does not depend on the blackbody temperature, nor does it depend on physical constants, such as the Planck's constant or the speed of light.

In Fig. 2, the energy of all photon clusters with ranks $m \geq 2$ corresponds to the area enclosed between curve $m = 1$ and the Planck's spectrum, which is shown by the solid black curve.

It is noteworthy that the energy density of cluster radiation of arbitrary rank, according to (35), tends to a constant $u_m(\nu) \to 8\pi h\nu^3/c^3$ at any fixed frequency as the temperature increases to infinity $T \to \infty$. This constant is independent of cluster rank. Therefore, at high temperature $kT > mh\nu$, cluster radiation of any rank less than $m = \frac{kT}{h\nu}$ has, by the order of magnitude, the same energy density. The total energy density of thermal radiation tends to infinity as $T \to \infty$ only because the number of ranks of clusters effectively emitted at the selected frequency is increasing.

F. Portion of coalescent photons in thermal radiation

Dividing the energy density of m-photon cluster radiation (35) by $\varepsilon = h\nu$ yields the density of photons involved in the creation of m-photon clusters per unit frequency interval:

$$\rho_m(\nu) = \frac{u_m(\nu)}{h\nu} = \frac{8\pi\nu^2}{c^3} \exp\left(-\frac{mh\nu}{kT}\right). \tag{44}$$

Integrating (44) over frequency yields the total number of photons per unit volume that belong to m-photon clusters:

$$N_m = \int_0^{\infty} \rho_m(\nu) d\nu = \frac{16\pi k^3}{m^3 c^3 h^3} T^3, \tag{45}$$

which is the Stefan-Boltzmann law prototype for the total number of photons in m-photon clusters. Wherefrom, by analogy with (43), one may calculate the portion of photons involved in photon clusters of ranks $m \geq 2$:

$$\frac{N - N_1}{N} \simeq 0.168, \tag{46}$$

where N is the total number of photons per unit volume in the blackbody cavity. It can be evaluated using (45) with the zeta-function appearing in the result:

$$N = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} N_m = N_1 \zeta(3) \simeq 1.2021\, N_1. \tag{47}$$

It follows from (46) that almost 17% of all photons in the Universe are coalescent, i. e. belong to photon clusters of ranks $m \geq 2$.

VI. PHOTON CLUSTER EMISSION SPECTRA VERSUS WAVELENGTH

The existence of photon clusters in blackbody radiation results in somewhat unexpected conclusions regarding the spectrum of blackbody radiation as a function of wavelength – the spectrum turns out to be sensitive to photon clusterization.

Indeed, in order to switch from the frequency to the wavelength in the Planck's formula (36), one typically makes use of the relationship between the wavelength and frequency of electromagnetic radiation:

$$\nu = \frac{c}{\lambda}, \qquad \Delta\nu = \frac{c}{\lambda^2}\Delta\lambda. \tag{48}$$

Substituting (48) in (36) gives the standard Planck's law for the energy density in blackbody cavity as a function of

wavelength (λ-spectrum):

$$U_p(\lambda) = \frac{8\pi hc}{\lambda^5} \frac{1}{\exp\left(\frac{hc}{\lambda kT}\right) - 1}. \qquad (49)$$

However, (48) is valid only for single photons, and invalid for coalescent photons. This is because the wavelength λ of a quantum particle is inversely proportional to its momentum p in accordance with the de Broglie formula $\lambda = \frac{h}{p}$. Therefore, the wavelength λ_m of m-photon cluster is related to the wavelength λ of a constituent photon as

$$\lambda_m = \frac{h}{mp} = \frac{\lambda}{m}, \qquad (50)$$

where p is the momentum of single photon, mp is the momentum of m-photon cluster that consists of m indistinguishable photons with the same momentum. Hence, if m photons stick together forming an m-photon cluster then, according to (50), their wavelength becomes m times smaller.

This conclusion is of fundamental importance for the results discussed below. Equation (50) has been repeatedly confirmed in experiments with clusters of various ranks [12, 13], so it can be considered as reliably established. It follows from (50) that if photons stick together to make a photon cluster, it will appear in a mode with different wavelength. That will inevitably give rise to some modification of the Planck's formula (49). No modification of Planck's radiation law (36) is required because, in contrast to photon wavelength, photon frequency is clusterization-insensitive.

It follows from (50) that $\lambda = m\lambda_m$. Combining this result with (48) we obtain the following rules:

$$\nu = \frac{c}{m\lambda_m}, \qquad \Delta\nu = \frac{c}{m\lambda_m^2}\Delta\lambda_m. \qquad (51)$$

Equations (51) take into account the fact that if m indistinguishable photons stick together then their frequency does not change while their wavelength becomes m times smaller. The second equation in (51) is obtained by differentiating the first one.

Equations (51) shall be used instead of (48) if connection between frequency and wavelength is needed for the m-photon cluster radiation. In this respect, (51) is the generalization of (48) for cluster radiation.

Substituting (51) in (35) for a unit wavelength interval $\Delta\lambda_m = 1$ and renaming independent variable λ_m into λ, we obtain:

$$u_m(\lambda) = \frac{8\pi hc}{m^4\lambda^5} \exp\left(-\frac{hc}{\lambda kT}\right), \qquad (52)$$

which is the energy density of thermal radiation of m-photon clusters versus wavelength. All functions (52) for various cluster ranks have the same shape with the only difference being in amplitude, which is inversely proportional to the fourth power of cluster rank. Therefore, at any wavelength, energy densities of thermal radiation of single-photon clusters, two-photon clusters, and three-photon clusters are related as $1{:}\frac{1}{16}{:}\frac{1}{81}$, respectively.

Summing (52) over all ranks m with (41) taken into account we obtain a total radiation energy density as a function of wavelength:

$$U(\lambda) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} u_m(\lambda) = \frac{4\pi^5 hc}{45\lambda^5} \exp\left(-\frac{hc}{\lambda kT}\right). \qquad (53)$$

This formula, in contrast to the standard Planck's law (49), takes into account the cluster nature of blackbody radiation. The standard Planck's law (49) is valid only in a single-photon approximation to the radiation field and does not take into account the existence of photon clusters.

Fig. 3 shows the modified spectrum (53) in comparison with the standard Planck's law (49) thus explaining how the existence of photon clusters affects the λ-spectrum of blackbody radiation.

The modified radiation law (53) differs from the Planck's law (49) due to the wavelength reduction in the process of photon clusterization. According to (37), low-frequency photons with a larger wavelength most effectively stick together. Therefore, radiation energy is pumped through photon clusterization from the region of larger wavelengths to the region of medium wavelengths. This process results in the increase of maximum in comparison with the standard Planck's law (Figure 3). The maxima of two curves are offset by $\sim 0.007\lambda$, the ratio of the two functions at the maximum is approximately equal to 1.075 while the areas under the curves coincide exactly.



Figure 3. The Planck's law (49) for blackbody radiation spectrum (black) as a function of wavelength λ and modified spectrum (53) that takes into account the existence of photon clusters (gray). Both curves correspond to blackbody temperature $T = 6000K$.

Thus, if some photons stick together then the standard Planck's law (49) for λ-spectrum of thermal radiation must be substituted with equation (53).

The existence of photon clusters in thermal radiation clarifies the mechanism of "photon bunching" effect that was studied in [11]. This effect consists in abnormally high probability that photons, located in an arbitrary volume in blackbody radiation, are found in a part of that volume. In view of the cluster theory of blackbody radiation, it is clear that if there is a chance that photons stick together to form a photon cluster then this cluster will be either

in one or another part of the volume under consideration, thus increasing the probability that all photons are just in one part of the chosen volume.

To conclude this Section, the following should be emphasized. If the BE statistics is valid in the form of the Mandel's formula (10) then the blackbody radiation should contain photon clusters and, therefore, the Planck's law for λ-spectrum of thermal radiation should be modified. If, on the contrary, there are no photon clusters and the Planck's law is correct then our understanding of quantum statistics and the Mandel's formula (10) should be modified. In other words, the Mandel's formula (10) is incompatible with the Planck's law (49) because the former predicts the existence of photon clusters while the latter is valid only in a single-photon approximation to the radiation field.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Fundamentally new results obtained in this paper are based on the following facts that are firmly established:

1. The BE statistics in an arbitrary volume is presented by the Mandel's formula (10).

2. The Mandel's formula is a negative binomial distribution.

3. A negative binomial distribution is a special case of Compound Poisson Distribution.

4. The wavelength of N coalescent photons is N times smaller than the wavelength of a single photon.

Facts number 1 and number 3 were established in about the middle of the 20th century. Fact number 2 is a trivial observation. Fact number 4, which is the consequence of de Broglie's formula, was confirmed in several independent experiments conducted after 1987 when coalescent photons were discovered.

In this paper the following new results are obtained on the basis of the above facts:

1. It is proven that the existence of photon clusters (coalescent photons) is a consequence of quantum statistics.

2. Distribution by rank (which is the number of constituent photons) is found for photon clusters in blackbody radiation.

3. It is shown that photon clusters in thermal radiation obey the Poisson statistics.

4. It is proven that the BE statistics is the result of superposition of two random processes: 1) random number of photon clusters entering the selected volume, and 2) random number of photons contained in each cluster.

5. Spectra of cluster components of blackbody radiation are obtained.

6. It is proven that the Mandel's formula for the BE statistics in an arbitrary volume is incompatible with the Planck's law for λ-spectrum of thermal radiation. This incompatibility is due to the fact that the Mandel's formula predicts the existence of photon clusters while the Planck's formula does not take into account the cluster nature of radiation.

7. It is shown that the λ-spectrum of thermal radiation should depend on the level of photon clusterization. At the same time, photon clusterization does not affect the ν-spectrum of thermal radiation, so that the standard Planck's law for the ν-spectrum of thermal radiation can be derived from the cluster nature of radiation.

It should be noted that the linearity of Maxwell's equations for electromagnetic field implies that photons do not interact with each other. Non-interacting particles must obey Poisson statistics, which is true for photons in a coherent field. The BE statistics, which is valid for blackbody radiation, differs from the Poisson statistics. That difference, however, does not imply that there is any interaction between photons in blackbody radiation – there is certainly no interaction. Instead, there is some probability that photons may be found in coalescent states, or in the form of photon clusters. That is the reason behind the difference between the BE statistics and the classical Poisson statistics.

APPENDIX 1

Photon cluster statistics in thermal radiation and cluster distribution by the number of constituent photons

A. Photon cluster statistics

Probability $g_k(\tau)$ that k clusters (regardless of their rank) are in volume τ will be found here without resort to Compound Poisson Distribution.

It follows from (13) that in quantum statistics relative probability $q_n(\tau)$ that n photons are in volume τ can be presented as

$$q_n(\tau) = \frac{b^n}{n!}\tau(\tau+1)\dots(\tau+n-1) \tag{54}$$

where

$$b = \frac{w}{1+w} \tag{55}$$

The rising factorial $\tau^{\bar{n}}$ in (54) can be expanded in powers of τ:

$$\tau(\tau+1)\dots(\tau+n-1) = S_{n1}\tau + S_{n2}\tau^2 + \dots + S_{nn}\tau^n \tag{56}$$

where S_{nk} are Stirling numbers of the first kind.

Introducing notation

$$c_{nk} = \frac{b^n}{n\,!} S_{nk} \tag{57}$$

we can present (54) as a system of equations for $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$

$$\begin{aligned} q_0(\tau) &= 1 \\ q_1(\tau) &= 0 + c_{11}\tau \\ q_2(\tau) &= 0 + c_{21}\tau + c_{22}\tau^2 \\ &\ldots \quad \ldots \\ q_n(\tau) &= 0 + c_{n1}\tau + c_{n2}\tau^2 + \cdots + c_{nn}\tau^n \\ &\ldots \quad \ldots \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

Based on the meaning of equations (6)-(8) discussed in Section II, we may conclude that $c_{nk}\tau^k$ in (58) is relative probability that k arbitrary clusters are in volume τ provided there are n photons ($n \geq k$) in this volume. A single photon is considered to be a one-photon cluster.

For example, if there are three photons in the selected volume then $c_{31}\tau$ is the probability that all three photons are stuck together into one three-photon cluster, $c_{32}\tau^2$ is the probability that there are two clusters in volume τ (a two-photon cluster and a separate photon), and $c_{33}\tau^3$ is the probability that three particles (i. e. three separate photons) are in volume τ.

It follows from the above that the sum of all elements of k-th column in (58) gives the relative probability that k arbitrary clusters are in volume τ. We denote this quantity by $u_k(\tau)$:

$$u_k(\tau) = \frac{g_k(\tau)}{g_0(\tau)} = \tau^k \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{nk}. \tag{59}$$

Obviously,

$$g_0(\tau) = p_0(\tau) \tag{60}$$

because if there are no photons in volume τ then there are no photon clusters in this volume (and vice versa). The summation in (59) may start from zero since matrix c_{nk} is triangular (the first k elements in each column are zeros).

Given (57) the sum in (59) can be reduced to the known generating function for the Stirling numbers of the first kind [14]:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{nk} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{S_{nk}}{n!} b^n = \frac{1}{k\,!} \left(\ln \frac{1}{1-b} \right)^k, \tag{61}$$

which due to (55) may be written as

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{nk} = \frac{\ln^k(1+w)}{k!}. \tag{62}$$

Now, from (59) and (62) we obtain for the statistics of photon clusters

$$g_k(\tau) = g_0(\tau) \frac{\tau^k}{k!} \ln^k(1+w), \tag{63}$$

where $g_k(\tau)$ is the probability that k arbitrary photon clusters (regardless of their rank) are in volume τ.

Note that in view of (60) and (12) statistics (63) can be presented as

$$g_k(\tau) = \frac{(\eta\tau)^k}{k\,!} \exp(-\eta\tau), \tag{64}$$

which is a Poisson statistics with parameter

$$\eta = \ln(1+w). \tag{65}$$

So we obtained results (17) and (20), which have long been known in the theory of Compound Poisson Distribution [9].

It follows from (64) that η is the average number of clusters (of any rank) in a coherence volume. Parameter η is always less than the mode-average number of photons w because some photons are stuck together to form a photon cluster. Hence, for the average number of photons per cluster we obtain

$$\frac{w}{\eta} = \frac{w}{\ln(1+w)}. \tag{66}$$

This quantity is always greater than unity. In the high-frequency part of the spectrum, the degeneracy parameter is small $w \ll 1$. In this limit, as it follows from (66), there is about one photon per cluster. This means that in the UV limit, thermal radiation contains a vanishingly small number of multiphoton clusters. However, in the low-frequency limit, where $w \gg 1$, one cluster may contain a large number of photons. For example, if $w = 50$ then, according to (66), one cluster contains on the average over 12 photons. Thus, in the low-frequency part of the spectrum, thermal radiation consists mostly of multiphoton clusters.

This situation is typical only for thermal radiation, as well as for the states of radiation field close to thermal equilibrium. There is every reason to believe that if the radiation source is far from thermodynamic equilibrium then the portion of multiphoton clusters in its radiation is small, while in the emission of strongly non-equilibrium light sources, such as lasers, multiphoton clusters are absent and all the clusters contain just a single photon.

Note that when indistinguishable photons stick together their energy does not change because there is no interaction between photons. Therefore, the clusterization process cannot affect the partition function Z of photon gas:

$$Z = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-n\beta\varepsilon} = \frac{1}{1 - \exp(-\beta\varepsilon)}, \tag{67}$$

where $\beta = 1/kT$, and $\varepsilon = h\nu$ is the energy of one-photon excitation of radiation mode at frequency ν. If the partition function is not sensitive to photon clusterization then

the results obtained from the partition function are valid regardless of clusterization process. In particular, for the mean energy of mode excitation, taking into account (67), we obtain

$$\langle\varepsilon\rangle = -\frac{1}{Z}\frac{\partial Z}{\partial\beta} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\exp(\beta\varepsilon)-1}, \tag{68}$$

from where the average number of photons per mode is

$$w = \frac{\langle\varepsilon\rangle}{h\nu} = \frac{1}{\exp(\beta\varepsilon)-1}. \tag{69}$$

Equations (65) and (69) yield

$$\eta = -\ln\left[1-\exp(-\beta\varepsilon)\right], \tag{70}$$

which is the mean number of photon clusters per mode as a function of the radiation frequency and blackbody temperature. Comparing (70) with (67) we may conclude that the mode-average number of clusters

$$\eta = \ln Z \tag{71}$$

is simply the logarithm of the partition function of the photon gas.

B. Distribution of photon clusters by rank (by the quantity of constituent photons)

Let us find the probability f_m that a photon cluster chosen at random consists of m photons. If η is the mode-average number of clusters then $f_m\eta$ is the mode-average quantity of m-photon clusters. Then $mf_m\eta$ is the mode-average number of photons contained in the m-photon clusters. Therefore, the sum of $mf_m\eta$ over all ranks m should give the mode-average number of photons:

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} mf_m\eta = w. \tag{72}$$

An infinite number of unknown quantities f_m can be found from equation (72) because the right-hand side of this equation is the known expandable function.

Indeed, eq. (55) gives

$$w = \frac{b}{1-b}. \tag{73}$$

Comparing this expression with (69) we obtain

$$b = e^{-\beta\varepsilon}. \tag{74}$$

This implies that $0 < b < 1$ for any frequency and temperature. Therefore, (73) can be expanded as

$$w = \frac{b}{1-b} = b + b^2 + \ldots + b^k + \ldots \tag{75}$$

In equation (72) we change variables according to

$$f_m = x_m b^m, \tag{76}$$

which means that instead of the unknown quantities f_m we will seek for x_m.

Substituting (75) and (76) in (72) yields

$$\eta\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} mx_m b^m = b + b^2 + \ldots + b^m + \ldots\ . \tag{77}$$

This equation, as well as (72), should hold identically for any b. Therefore, equating the coefficients at equal powers of b in the right and left sides of (77), we obtain the unknown coefficients:

$$x_m = \frac{1}{m\eta}. \tag{78}$$

Using (65), (55), and (78) we obtain from (76):

$$f_m = x_m b^m = \frac{b^m}{m\eta} = \frac{w^m}{m(1+w)^m\ln(1+w)}, \tag{79}$$

This result coincides with (21), i. e. the problem of finding probabilities f_m is solved. Equation (79), due to (69), gives distribution of photon clusters by the number of constituent photons as a function of radiation frequency and blackbody temperature.

It is evident from (79) that expression for f_0 is meaningless because there are no clusters containing zero photons. Therefore any summation over cluster ranks should start from $m = 1$.

Using (55) and (65) it is easy to verify that probabilities (79) satisfy the normalization condition

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} f_m = \frac{1}{\eta}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{b^m}{m} = \frac{-\ln(1-b)}{\eta} = 1. \tag{80}$$

The main results of Appendix 1 may be summarized as follows: statistics of photon clusters (64) and distribution of clusters by the number of constituent photons (79) obtained in Appendix 1 are fully consistent with the results obtained in [9] for the Negative Binomial Distribution as a special case of Compound Poisson Distribution.

[1] C. K. Hong, Z. Y. Ou, and L. Mandel, "*Measurement of Subpicosecond Time Intervals between Two Photons by Interference*", Phys.Rev.Lett. 59, 18, p.2045 (1987);

[2] "*The Physics of Quantum Information*", edited by D. Bouwmeester et al. (Springer, Berlin, 2000);

[3] M. Genovese, "*Research on hidden variable theories: A*

review of recent progresses", Physics Reports, Vol. 413, No 6, pp. 319-396 (2005); Marco Genovese, Paolo Traina, "*Review on Qudits Production and Their Application to Quantum Communication and Studies on Local Realism*", Advanced Science Letters, Vol. 1, No 2, pp. 153-160 (2008);

[4] Pieter Kok *et al.*, "*Linear Optical Quantum Computing*", Rev. Mod. Phys., Vol. 79, No 1, pp. 135-174 (2007);

[5] Z.Y. Ou and L. Mandel, *"Non-local and non-classical effects in two-photon downconversion*", Quant. Opt. 2, pp. 71-88 (1990);

[6] Yanhua Shih, "*Entangled Photons*", IEEE Journal of selected topics in quantum electronics, vol. 9, No. 6, p. 1455 (2003);

[7] Kaige Wang, "*Quantum Theory of Two-Photon Wavepacket Interference in a Beam Splitter*", J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. vol. 39, No 18 (2006);

[8] G. Di Giuseppe, M. Atature, M. D. Shaw, A. V. Sergienko, B. E. A. Saleh, M. C. Teich, A. J. Miller, S. W. Nam, and J. Martinis, "*Direct observation of photon pairs at a single output port of a beam-splitter interferometer*", Phys. Rev. A **68**, 063817 (2003);

[9] William Feller, *An Introduction to Probability Theory and its Applications*, v. 1, Chapter 12, Third Edition (1968), John Wiley & Sons, Inc.;

[10] Leonard Mandel, "*Fluctuations of Photon Beams: The Distribution of the Photo-Electrons*", Proc. Phys. Soc. (London) 74, pp. 233-243 (1959);

[11] Aleksey Ilyin, "*Generalized Binomial Distribution in Photon Statistics*", Open Phys., vol. 13, pp. 41-49 (2015);

[12] K. Edamatsu, R. Shimizu, T. Itoh, "*Measurement of the Photonic de Broglie Wavelength of entangled Photon Pairs Generated by Spontaneous Parametric Down-Conversion*", Phys. Rev. Lett., vol. 89, No 21, p. 213601 (2002);

[13] B. H. Liu, F. W. Sun, Y. X. Gong, Y. F. Huang, G. C. Guo, and Z. Y. Ou, "*Four-photon interference with asymmetric beam splitters*", Optics Letters, Vol. 32, Issue 10, pp. 1320-1322 (2007);

[14] Ronald L. Graham, Donald E. Knuth, Oren Patashnik, *Concrete Mathematics*, Chapter 7 (formula 7.50), Second Edition (2006).